REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 22, 27, and 28 are currently pending. Claims 3, 4, 12, 20, and 21 have been canceled without prejudice; Claims 27 and 28 have been added; and Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 18, 19, and 22 have been amended by the present amendment. The changes and additions to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the Pre-Interview Communication, Claims 10-13 and 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; and Claims 1-5, 10-13, and 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0221026 to Dorland (hereinafter "the '026 application") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0030768 to Krishnamoorthy et al. (hereinafter "the '768 application").

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 18-22 are rendered moot by the present cancellation of Claims 20 and 21 and by the present amendment to Claims 18 and 19. Claim 18 has been amended to be directed to a non-transmissive computer readable medium storing program instructions, which when executed by a computer causes a computer to manage information related to at least one monitored device communicatively coupled to a network. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 10 is rendered moot by the present amendment to that claim. Claim 10 has been amended to include a first memory storing at least one protocol object. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10 is not directed to software *per se*.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method of managing information related to at least one monitored device communicatively coupled to a network, comprising:

> selecting a communication protocol among a plurality of communication protocols used to extract status information from the at least one monitored device;
>
> retrieving, from a first memory, by a protocol object associated with the selected communication protocol, vendor and model information of the at least one monitored device;
>
> obtaining, by the protocol object, a vendor name of a monitored device of the at least one monitored device supported by the selected communication protocol;
>
> obtaining, by the protocol object, a model name corresponding to the obtained vendor name;
>
> concatenating the obtained vendor name and the obtained model name to generate a descriptive string;
>
> determining if the descriptive string is present in a vendor-model support map stored in a second memory, the vendor-model support map having at least one entry, wherein each entry includes a descriptive string and a vendor-model value;
>
> if the determining step determines that the descriptive string is not present in the vendor-model support map, storing the descriptive string in the vendor-model support map in association with the protocol object; and
>
> repeating the selecting, retrieving, obtaining the vendor name, obtaining the model name, concatenating, determining, and storing steps for each protocol of the plurality of communication protocols to generate a vendor-model support map for each of the plurality of communication protocols.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations recited in Claims 3 and 4. Accordingly, no new matter has been added. See also Figures 32A and 32B and the discussion related thereto in the specification.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office Action asserts that the '026 application discloses everything in Claim 1 with the exception of creating a descriptive string, determining if the descriptive string is present in the second

memory, and storing the descriptive string in the second memory, and relies on the '768 application to remedy those deficiencies.

The '026 application is directed to a method of managing a network, wherein the network has first and second network manager devices. See, e.g., e-manager 102 and e-manager 122 shown in Figure 1. In particular, the '026 application discloses that one of the network manager devices manages a first portion of a database, while a second network manager device manages a second portion of the database. Further, as shown on page 5 of the '026 application, the '026 application discloses a configuration file or configuration information for the e-manager, which is an XML file. As shown in the XML file, the file includes model and vendor information for support devices.

However, as admitted in the outstanding Office Action, the '026 application fails to disclose creating a descriptive string by using the obtained vendor name and the obtained model name. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that the '026 application fails to disclose concatenating the obtained vendor name and the obtained model name to generate a descriptive string. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the '026 application fails to disclose the step of determining if the descriptive string is present in a vendor-model support map stored in a second memory, the vendor-model support map having at least one entry, wherein each entry includes a descriptive string and a vendor-model value.[1]

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the '026 application fails to disclose the step of repeating the selecting, retrieving, obtaining the vendor name, obtaining the model name, concatenating, determining, and storing steps for each protocol of the plurality of communication protocols to generate a vendor-model support map for each of the plurality of communication protocols, as recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the '026 application is silent regarding generating a vendor-model support map for each of

[1] See, e.g., Figure 32A and Figure 32B.

the plurality of communication protocols. Rather, the '026 application merely discloses a configuration file for a monitoring device.

The '768 application is directed to a method for updating a software module in a plurality of devices in a storage network and including the steps of discovering and generating a list of devices in a storage network, determining the topology of the storage network, receiving a request of updated software of a plurality of devices, authenticating the request, validating the list of devices with the firmware, and transferring a file to at least one agent responsible for managing at least one of the devices. Further, as shown in Figure 11, the '768 application discloses an example data structure for a peripheral simple configuration header, wherein the header includes data related to the header size, the vendor ID, a product ID, etc.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '768 application fails to disclose the step of concatenating the obtained vendor name and the obtained model name to generate a descriptive string. Figure 11 does not disclose concatenating two strings. In this regard, Applicants note that the separating lines shown in Figure 11 are meant to merely separate the different fields, but are not actual string separators and do not signify concatenation.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the '768 application fails to disclose determining if a descriptive string is present in a vendor-model support map stored in a second memory, the vendor-model support map having at least one entry, wherein each entry includes a descriptive string and a vendor-model value, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the '768 application fails to disclose repeating the selecting, retrieving, obtaining the vendor name, obtaining the model name, concatenating, determining, and storing steps for each protocol of the plurality of communication protocols to generate a vendor-model support map for each of the plurality of communication protocols, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Thus, no matter how the teachings of the '026 and '768 applications are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest the concatenating, determining, and repeating steps recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 is rendered moot and that Claim 1 patentably defines over any proper combination of the '026 and '768 applications.

The present amendment also sets forth new dependent Claims 27 and 28 for examination on the merits. New Claim 27, which depends from Claim 1, clarifies that each protocol object includes a type of status information, a weight of the status information, and information for extracting the type of status information from the monitored device using the corresponding communication protocol. Claim 27 is supported by the originally filed specification and does not add new matter.[2]

New Claim 28, which depends from Claim 27, clarifies that method further comprises checking whether the weight of status information stored in the protocol object is greater than a corresponding weight associated with status information stored in the second memory.[3] Applicants respectfully submit that the limitations recited in Claims 27 and 28 are not disclosed by any proper combination of the cited references.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 10, and 18 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over any proper combination of the '026 and '768 applications.

[2] See, e.g., paragraph [0051] of the published application.
[3] See paragraph [0051].

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

James J. Kulbaski
Registration No. 34,648
Attorney of Record

Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461

I:\ATTY\KMB\245'S\245418US-RSID423-MOTOYAMA\245418US-AM.DOC